

the saloon keepers, and that three barrels more would be purchased by the committee, as what was donated would be inadequate for the occasion. I asked for permission to use this family's name in this reply and received the following: "Does it not strike you as being a breach of confidence to have her name brought into the controversy, besides being a most unfriendly act towards myself and family, all of whom have held you in the highest esteem? \* \* \* As a minister of the Gospel you were generally understood to be the confidant of your parishioners." Hence my inability to make public the names. I must say, too, that although I lived in that ward for over two years, I never even guessed that "the Church authorities do not tolerate the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage to any degree whatever." I do know that they do not attempt to tolerate such evil spirits, otherwise it would be impossible for two saloons and wine shops galore to thrive as no other business does in such a small community, where there are not a half dozen Gentile families, all of whom except one are strictly temperate, to the best of my knowledge. The sequence of such a state of affairs is quite natural.

2. For my second statement I did not rely wholly upon anybody's information. I was standing in the doorway of our church on the evening of the picnic and saw the juveniles to which I referred, returning from the picnic grounds in an intoxicated condition. That is not hearsay by any means. For the statement that they were intoxicated on the grounds I have the authority,

First—Of a friend in whom I have every confidence and much evidence of his truthfulness, who with his family saw what I reported. I asked for permission to use his name in my defense and received in reply this: My dear brother, I had hoped that picnic letter had been forgotten; I am very sorry indeed I ever spoke about it. \* \* \* I can not see any good whatever in agitating the matter, and it will do me a positive injury and you no good. \* \* \* For the sake of peace let us keep still, or at least let me keep still, and do not let my name appear in print, as I am satisfied no good can come from a reply and much harm will result." In deference to his wish I withheld his name.

2. A family among whom I was called in official duty the following Sunday told me, as I was remarking on what I saw and had been told, that "the small boys were not the only ones drunk." In confirmation of the foregoing they told me that when ready to go home they looked for their conveyance but found it not. On inquiry they discovered that it was tied in front of a saloon in Tooele, and just as the marshal was ready to go in search for it a load of "hoodlums" returned with it, bearing the evidence of the imbibings. I withheld this name also, for the reason that I have not asked permission to use it.

3. In regard to statement number three, here are the facts: On my way to the postoffice the next morning I called at Mr. Doubray's store on some business matter. He not being in, I was asked to wait a few minutes,

which I did. While waiting I could not help but hear a conversation between three men whom I could not see and one of the clerks. The actions of some who attended the dance the night before were characterized in no uncertain terms. I took down in writing as much of the conversation as I wished. Then going to the home of the friend who gave me the first information I received about the thing, I repeated what I had heard, and was told: "Yes, sir, that's true. I never saw so many drunken men and women at a dance before. I'll never go again!" With a good deal of irony, I confess, I said: "And the Bishop could open such 'bacchanalian proceedings as that with prayer!" "Yes," she said, "they always do that." From there I went to the postoffice, and while waiting for my mail, what I had previously heard was confirmed by the babel of voices surrounding that door. For I could hear of nothing else.

This I consider to be evidence sufficiently cumulative and corroborative to either substantiate what I wrote, or to remove from my name the odium which the communication from Tooele sought to place thereon.

In conclusion I wish to say that the statement or "affidavit" which was used as the climax to the Tooele communication, turns out to be no affidavit at all. The person who in it is made to affirm that "to his certain knowledge the account of said picnic is entirely untrue" was not near the place, nor did he see any of the proceedings during the day. Neither did he authorize the publication of his signature to such a document. He simply said to the Bishop who importuned him for it, that in the light of developments he thought I did both Mormons and Gentiles an injustice (for making such things public, I suppose.)

I remain yours for the truth,  
T. J. HOOPER.

#### ELDER NICHOLSON'S LECTURE.

The second of the series of weekly discourses in the Salt Lake Assembly Hall was delivered Feb. 10 by Elder John Nicholson. The subject was, "Are there any insuperable difficulties to the Acceptance of the Facts in which 'Mormonism' had its Origin." There was a large audience, the spacious building being filled. The following is a brief outline of the address:

After a few introductory remarks, as to the manner in which he proposed to treat the subject, the basis of which had been laid in the able historical discourse delivered by President Joseph F. Smith, delivered on the Wednesday previous, the speaker stated, for the benefit of those who were not present on that occasion, the leading facts in which Mormonism had its origin, viz:

The visitation of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ to Joseph Smith, in 1820; the visitation of the angel Moroni and the coming forth of the Book of Mormon; the visitation of the angel John the Baptist; the visitation of Peter, James and John; the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It might be objected that these facts

were too wonderful for belief. In answer to this presumed objection the speaker delineated by quotation and otherwise the marvelous character of the facts in which the primitive Christian Church, or Christianity itself, had its origin. Such a basis of rejection might have some appearance of plausibility if it came from one who had no belief either in former or latter-day revelation, but it was an untenable position for a Christian to assume.

It was next shown that all the Prophets had pointed to the latter days as a time when God would perform a work in the earth that would be a marvel and a wonder. This was to include the restoration of the Gospel as it existed in the days of Christ; the establishing of the mountain of the Lord's house on the top of the mountains, to which many people would flow; the gathering of Israel which was to be so remarkable as to eclipse the deliverance from Egyptian bondage; the setting up of the kingdom of God, as related in Daniel, which was finally to be given to the Saints of the Most High. Seeing that such a divine work was to be accomplished in the latter days, and as that in which the Latter-day Saints were engaged was possessed of all its conspicuous features, there appeared to be no good reason for the non-acceptance of the facts in which it had its origin.

Joseph Smith claimed to be a restorer of divine truth, the knowledge of which had been lost for many generations. If it could be shown that he was instrumental in inaugurating such a restoration his position in that respect would be proved.

The speaker here laid down a proposition to this effect: That the reliability of an alleged fact depends upon the nature of other facts accompanying or associated with it.

He then proceeded to the consideration of the five leading facts in seriatim, the first being the visit of the Father and the Son to the boy Prophet, Joseph Smith, in 1820. The two great initiatory events in the history of the earth, from a religious standpoint were, first, the beginning of its being peopled; the other when the plan of redemption should be finally introduced into the world never to be taken from it until the Redeemer's work should be accomplished. This irremovable position belonged to the great latter-day dispensation. The first was not more important perhaps than the second of these two events. In the beginning God walked and talked with man and the latter was thus made acquainted with His appearance and true character. It was therefore not unreasonable to expect that at the opening of the great final dispensation the Deity would take the same course, for the Lord is without shadow of turning.

The necessity for this at once appears when the general idea in relation to the Almighty is considered. Here the speaker explained, by quotation, the sectarian idea of one only living and true God, "three persons of one substance," "without body parts and passions." Hence, in the glorious visitation to the Prophet, the divine being not only communicated to him the fact that he had been selected to begin a great and marvelous work